

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Applicant :	Yang et al.	Art Unit :	3689
Serial No. :	09/854,306	Examiner :	MOONEYHAM, Janice A
Filed :	May 11, 2001	Docket. :	120719.05005
Title :	SOFTWARE LICENSING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM		

ATTN: Office of Petitions

Mail Stop Petitions
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Petition for Revival Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.137(b)

Sir:

Applicants hereby petition for the revival of the above-identified utility patent application (the "subject application") under 37 CFR §1.137(b) as the abandonment of the application was unintentional, and the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the required reply until the filing of this grantable petition under 37 CFR §1.137(b) was unintentional.

The subject application became abandoned for failure to (i) timely reopen prosecution or (ii) request rehearing, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §41.50(b) following a Decision on Appeal. The entire delay in taking the required action from the due date for the required action until the filing of this grantable petition under 37 CFR §1.137(b) was unintentional. Particularly, Applicants note the following course of events:

- On 1 August 2007 Applicants' former representatives at the law firm of Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker, LLP filed an appeal brief appealing the final rejection mailed 1 February 2007.
- On 15 November 2007 Examiner Janice A Mooneyham mailed an Examiner's Answer to Applicants' Appeal Brief.
- On 15 January 2007 Applicants' former representatives filed a Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer.
- On 10 July 2009 Applicants current representatives at the law firm of Holland & Knight LLP mailed an engagement letter to Applicants to begin formal representation of Applicants.
- On 30 July 2009 a Decision on Appeal was mailed to Applicants' former representatives at the law firm of Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker, LLP.

- In part, the Decision on Appeal required Applicants to (i) reopen prosecution or (ii) request rehearing within two months from the date of the Decision on Appeal, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §41.50(b).
- 30 September 2009 the time period for taking action under 37 C.F.R. §41.50(b) lapsed.
- On 27 October 2009 a Notice of Abandonment was mailed to Applicants' former representatives at the law firm of Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker, LLP
- On, or about, 12 April 2010 the abandoned status of the subject application was discovered by Applicants' current representatives.

An appropriate amendment of the claims, required to reopen prosecution pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §41.50(b), accompanies this petition. Additionally, the petition fee set forth in 37 CFR §1.17(m) also accompanies this petition. As the above-identified utility patent application was filed after June 8, 1995, no terminal disclaimer is believed required.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the entire delay in filing the required amendment from the due date for the required amendment until the filing of this grantable petition under 37 CFR §1.137(b) was unintentional. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully petition that the above-identified utility patent application be revived.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 9 September 2010

/Jeffrey T. Placker/
Jeffrey T. Placker
Reg. No. 47,862

Holland & Knight LLP
10 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116-3889
Telephone 617-305-2010
Facsimile 617-523-6850

9759337_v1